



TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 14, 1999

1999



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Band 14

Gerhard Dobesch
zum 15. 9. 1999

1999


H O L Z H A U S E N

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

In Zusammenarbeit mit:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Wolfgang Hameter, Bernhard Palme
Georg Rehrenböck, Hans Taeuber

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Disketten in MAC- und DOS-Formaten sind willkommen.

Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgeschickt werden.

Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung:

Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 2000 by Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Wien

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien.

Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.

e-mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder Bernhard.Palme@oeaw.ac.at

Hersteller: Druckerei A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien.

Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

Peter Siewert (Wien): Antony E. Raubitschek †	1
Petra Amann (Wien): Theopomp und die Etrusker	3
Antti Arjava (Helsinki): Eine Freilassung aus der väterlichen Gewalt: CPR VI 78	15
Filippo Canali De Rossi (Rom): Il restauro del passaggio al Monte Croce Carnico sotto Valentiniano, Valente e Graziano (Taf. 1)	23
Loredana Cappelletti (Wien): Autonius Iustinianus <i>rector provinciae Samnitium</i> (post 375 d.C.?)	29
Michel Christol (Paris), Thomas Drew Bear (Lyon): <i>L'initulatio</i> de la constitution de Galère et de ses collègues affichée à Sinope (CIL III 6979)	43
Matthew W. Dickie (Chicago): <i>Varia magica</i>	57
Claude Eilers (Hamilton, Ontario): M. Silanus, Stratoniceia, and the Governors of Asia under Augustus	77
Céline Grassien (Paris): 'Οτε φθείρουσιν οἱ χριστιανοὶ τὰς βίβλους τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, γράφοντες τροπάρια: l'exemple du P.Vindob. G 31487 (Tafel 2)	87
Christian Habicht (Princeton): Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten	93
Hermann Harrauer (Wien): Ausstellungskataloge und ihre Proble- matik	101
Linda Iapichino (Messina): La „guerra psicologica“ dell' <i>Anabasi</i> di Senofonte. Modalità di difesa e offesa, strumenti di difesa e offesa, utilizzo particolare delle armi e l'ideologia legata alla guerra ed alle armi	107
Ewald Kislinger (Wien): Zum Weinhandel in frühbyzantinischer Zeit	141
Claudia Kreuzsaler (Wien): Zwei Fragmente — eine Lohnquittung: SPP III 304 + 569 (Tafel 3)	157
Peter Kruschwitz, Andrea Beyer, Matthias Schumacher (Berlin): Revision von CLE 1910 (Tafel 3)	161
Avshalom Laniado (Tel Aviv): Un anthroponyme germanique dans une épitaphe chrétienne de Laodicée 'Brûlée'	167
Barnabás Lőrincz (Budapest): Ein neues Militärdiplom aus Pannonia inferior (Tafel 4)	173
Mischa Meier (Bielefeld): Beobachtungen zu den sogenannten Pest- schilderungen bei Thukydides II 47–54 und bei Prokop, <i>Bell. Pers.</i> II 22–23	177
Fritz Mitt Hof (Wien): Zur Pagusordnung des Herakleopolites (Taf. 4)	211

Federico Morelli (Wien): P.Vindob. G 28018: un ἐντάγιον ... e un altro uguale: P.Vindob. G 759	219
Michael Peachin (New York): Five Vindolanda Tablets, Soldiers, and the Law	223
Ivo Poll (Amsterdam): Die διαγράφων-Steuer im spätbyzantinischen und früharabischen Ägypten	237
Joshua D. Sosin (Durham, North Carolina): Tyrian stationarii at Puteoli	275
Gerhard Wirth (Bonn): Euxenippos — ein biederer athenischer Bürger	285
Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam): Coptic Tax Receipts: An Inventory	309
 Bemerkungen zu Papyri XII (<Korr. Tyche> 313–340)	325
Corrigendum zu Korr. Tyche 262	334
 Buchbesprechungen	335
<p>Géza Alföldy, <i>Die Bauinschriften des Aquäduktes von Segovia und des Amphitheaters von Tarraco.</i>, Berlin, New York 1997 (E. Weber: 335) — Roger S. Bagнал, Bruce W. Frier, <i>The Demography of Roman Egypt</i>, Cambridge 1994 (B. Palme: 335) — Rajko Bratož (Hrsg.), <i>Westillyricum und Nordostitalien in der spätrömischen Zeit — Zahodni Ilirik in severovzhodna Italija v poznorimski dobi</i>, Ljubljana 1996 (E. Weber: 338) — Werner Eck, <i>Tra epigrafia, prosopografia e archaeologia. Scritti scelti, rielaborati ed aggiornati</i>, Rom 1996 (F. Beutler-Kränzl: 338) — Gawdat Gabra, <i>Der Psalter im oxyrhynchitischen (mesokemischen / mittelägyptischen) Dialekt</i>, Heidelberg 1995 (H. Förster: 340) — Martin Hose, <i>Erneuerung der Vergangenheit. Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio</i>, Stuttgart, Leipzig 1994 (G. Dobesch: 341) — Franziska Kränzl und Ekkehard Weber, <i>Die römerzeitlichen Inschriften aus Rom und Italien in Österreich</i> Wien 1997 (E. Kettenhofen: 344) — Guy Labarre, <i>Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale</i>, Lyon 1996 (L. Ruscú: 346) — Magdalena Maczyńska, <i>Die Völkerwanderung. Geschichte einer ruhelosen Epoche im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert</i>. Zürich 1993 (G. Dobesch: 348) — Michael Maase, <i>Die Darstellung des Kaisers in der lateinischen Panegyrik</i>, Stuttgart 1994 (H. Heftner: 350) — Federico Morelli, <i>Olio e retribuzioni nell'Egitto tardo (V–VIII d. C.)</i>. Firenze 1996 (R. Mazza: 351) — Rolf Schuricht, <i>Cicero an Appius (Cic. fam. III). Umgangsformen in einer politischen Freundschaft</i>, Trier 1994 (G. Dobesch: 353) — Jennifer A. Sheridan, <i>Columbia Papyri IX: The Vestis Militaris Codex.</i>, Atlanta 1998 (F. Mitthof: 357) — Jörg Spielvogel, <i>Amicitia und res publica. Ciceros Maxime während der innenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen der Jahre 59–50 v. Chr.</i> Stuttgart 1993 (G. Dobesch: 362) — Volker Michael Strocka (Hrsg.), <i>Die Regierungszeit des Kaisers Claudius (41–54 n. Chr.). Umbruch oder Episode</i>, Mainz 1994 (G. Dobesch: 364) — Timothy M. Teeter, <i>Columbia Papyri XI</i>, Atlanta 1998 (A. Papatthomas: 370) — Gabriele Ziethe, <i>Gesandte vor Kaiser und Senat. Studien zum römischen Gesandtschaftswesen zwischen 30 v. Chr. und 117 n. Chr.</i> St. Katharinen 1994 (G. Dobesch: 372)</p>	
 Indices (Bettina Leiminger)	375
 Tafeln 1–4	

CLAUDE EILERS

M. Silanus, Stratoniceia, and the Governors of Asia under Augustus*

In the course of publishing inscriptions from Stratoniceia in 1988, Ender Varinlioğlu mentioned an unpublished inscription that refers to a M. Iunius Silanus as the patron and benefactor of that city¹. In a recent volume of this journal, Andrew Gregory has published this inscription as follows².

- 1 [? τὸ ἄγαλ]μα Μάρκου Ἰουνίου Σιλανοῦ
- 2 [τοῦ ἀνθυπάτ]ου, πάτρωνος καὶ εὐεργέ- vac.
- 3 [του τῆς πόλεως] διὰ προγόνων, ἀνθ' ὧν εἰς vac.
- 4 []του διηνεκῶς ἀπαραλλά-
- 5 [κτου ?] vac.

The following discussion will be in two parts. First, we shall consider whether this text can be improved upon; second, we shall argue for a different identification of Silanus.

The inscription's line length is more or less established by ll. 2–3, which Gregory has convincingly supplemented as πάτρωνος καὶ εὐεργέ[του τῆς πόλεως] διὰ προγόνων³. Gregory is surely correct to assume that the letters YE have been erroneously omitted from this line, rather than reading ἐργε[πιστάτου], which Gregory mentions and rejects. He points out that the formula πάτρων καὶ εὐεργέτης is very common, and that ἐργεπίστατος is not attested in this context⁴. Also, it should be noted that the three extant lines are longer than this one by about two letters at the right hand margin. This means that if the letters EY had not been omitted, the first four lines in the inscription would have almost exactly the same length.

* I am indebted to Dr. A. Gregory, Dr. F. Canali De Rossi, and Dr. G. Umholtz, who have suggested many improvements to this paper. Its faults are of course my own.

¹ E. Varinlioğlu, *Inscripfien von Stratonikeia in Karien*, EA 12 (1988) 93.

² A. P. Gregory, *A New and Some Overlooked Patrons of Greek Cities in the Early Principate*, Tyche 12 (1997) 85–91, no. 3.

³ For τῆς πόλεως, cf. I.Stratonikeia 1010 (cited below, n. 7). The words καὶ σωτήρος would also be possible here, though this would make little difference either to the line length or to the text's meaning. Cf. I.Stratonikeia 1321 = SEG 38, 1077: ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν | Πόπλιον Κορνήλιον | Ποπλίου υἱὸν Λέντολον | Μαρκελλῖνον τὸν πάτρωνα |⁵ καὶ εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτήρα | χρυσῶι στεφάνωι ἀριστεῖωι | καὶ εἰκῶνι χρυσῇ | ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας | τῆς εἰς ἑαυτόν.

⁴ Gregory (n. 2) 89.

Gregory supplies [τοῦ ἀνθυπάτου] at the beginning of l. 2, and this seems secure: all proposed identifications of Silanus, as we shall see, involve a proconsul. Sometimes in such inscriptions, however, a definite article appears between the titles „proconsul“ and „patron“⁵, and adding one here would result in a line of similar length to l. 3. Thus, at the beginning of l. 2, we should probably supply [τοῦ ἀνθυπάτου τοῦ πάτρωνος].

What stood at the beginning and end of this inscription is less certain. For l. 1, Gregory has suggested [τὸ ἄγαλ]μα, which he would interpret as referring to a secular image of Silanus, rather than to a cult statue⁶. This implies that our stone was originally a statue-base, on which stood a likeness of Silanus. In itself, this seems likely: the dimensions of the stone are typical of such bases, and this was a common way for a city to honour its patrons. The resulting text, however, is less convincing. Although some cities, including Stratoniceia, erected ἀγάλματα in honour of provincial governors, their inscriptions do not describe such distinctions in this way: statues, crowns, and other honours normally appear in the dative, designating the means by which the city honoured its benefactors⁷.

In any case, the letter mu in [ἄγαλ]μα is questionable. Only the bottom traces of what would be its final leg are in fact visible. By coincidence, the same two letters begin the next word, Μάρκου, as end this one. In Μάρκου, however, more space is left between the mu and the alpha. Also, the angle of the mu's final leg is slightly different, and its serif is on the opposite side. Admittedly, no stone-cutter's technique is perfectly consistent, but in this case the inconsistencies suggest a different letter.

If it does not modify [ἄγαλ]μα, why is Silanus' name in the genitive? In inscriptions mentioning Roman officials, this is most common when the honorand is a relative of the official: a son or a wife, for example. If we pursue this line of reasoning, the alpha at the end of this word limits the possibilities: a son (υἱόν) or brother (ἀδελφόν) is ruled out. The supplement [γυναῖ]κα is also excluded: whatever the penultimate letter of this word is, it has no diagonal descender and so cannot be a kappa. It is just possible, however, that the letter is a rho, the bowl of which sits high enough that it would have been lost in the abrasion at the edge of the stone⁸. The

⁵ Cf. IG XII 5, 756: ὁ δῆμος | Πόπλιον Οὐνίκιον | τὸν ἀνθυπάτον | τὸν πάτρωνα καὶ εὐεργέτην | πάσης ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα; I.Didyma 147: ὁ δῆμος ὁ Μιλησίων | Μεσσάλαν Ποτίτην ἀνθυπάτον | τὸν πάτρωνα τῆς πόλεως καὶ εὐεργέτην, ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας εἰς αὐτόν.

⁶ Gregory (n. 2) 89 and n. 18.

⁷ E. g., I.Stratoniceia 1010 = BCH 5 (1881) 183 no. 5, honouring another Augustan proconsul: ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν πάλιν καὶ ἐστεφανώσεν χρυσέαι στεφάνωι καὶ ἀγάλματι | μαρμαρίνωι Λεύκιον Καλπούρνιον Πίσωλνα τὸν πάτρωνα καὶ εὐεργέτην διὰ προγόνων τῆς πόλεως | ἡμῶν. Gregory (n. 2) 89 n. 18 observes that this inscription's letter-forms are no earlier than the second century A.D. and suggests that the honorand is the consul of A.D. 175 (PIR² C 295). Instead, we should suppose that the statue base was later renovated. Other patrons whose monuments were subsequently renovated are Q. Aemilius Lepidus at Cibra (IGR IV 901 with L. Robert, *Hellenica VII*, Paris 1949, 241–243); L. Licinius Lucullus at Synnada (MAMA IV 52 = IGR IV 701); and Q. Mucius Scaevola at Ephesus (I.Ephesos 630a with C. Eilers and N. Milner, AS 45 [1995] 80–81).

⁸ Gregory's photograph of the squeeze (Tyche 12 [1997] Tafel 7) does not make clear the extent of the damage at this point of the stone, which is worn away before it actually breaks off.

spacing, the angle of the hasta, and the serif are consistent with the other examples of rho in this inscription.

If this is correct, the honorand could be either Silanus' mother or his daughter, in which case we could supply [μητέ]ρα or [θυγατέ]ρα. On balance, a daughter is more likely, since we would normally expect the name of a wife or mother to include a filiation, and if the estimated line length is correct, there would not be room here. Moreover, supplying [Ἰουνίαν τὴν θυγατέ]ρα Μάρκου at the beginning of l. 1 produces a line that is the same length as ll. 2 and 3. Such a text would be typical of the inscriptions on statue bases that honour governors' relatives⁹.

This statue base has been reused as building material since antiquity, most recently in a stone fence that stands outside the depot at the site of Stratoniceia. In the process, it has been trimmed on several sides, clearly on the left and possibly on the right (where most of the upsilon of Σιλανοῦ has been lost). It is also possible that the top of the stone has been lost, along with what was originally the inscription's first line, which could have read [ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν]¹⁰.

The final lines of this text, beginning with the phrase ἀνθ' ὧν in l. 3, are difficult to provide credible supplements for. I have not been able to establish a convincing text here, but I offer several observations in the hope that others will be able to succeed where I have failed. The phrase ἀνθ' ὧν is not common in this type of inscription, though it presumably begins a justification for the honours reported or implied by the inscription. The phrase διηνεκῶς ἀπαράλλ[κτ-] („completely unchangeable ...“) is striking, and perhaps we can infer from it that Silanus had confirmed some privilege or recognised some long-standing right of Stratoniceia. Whatever the reference, the fact that something is „unchangeable“ may suggest a phrase like εἰς ἰ [ἀεί] or εἰς ἰ [τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον] in ll. 3–4, though a reference to the city (e. g. εἰς ἰ [τὴν πόλιν]) would also be possible. It is unclear whether the letters TOY, which could be a definite article, are to be taken with this phrase, or whether they were part of a prepositional phrase such as ὑπ' αὐ[τοῦ]. Hence ἀπαράλλ[κτ-], which presumably is an adjective, could go either with τοῦ or with the relative in ἀνθ' ὧν.

Despite the fact that a complete text cannot be offered, we have made some progress with the text and interpretation of this inscription. I would present it roughly as follows:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | [ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν] |
| 2 | [?Ἰουνίαν τὴν ?θυγατέ]ρα Μάρκου Ἰουνίου Σιλανοῦ |
| 3 | [τοῦ ἀνθυπάτου τ]οῦ πάτρωνος καὶ ε(ὕε)ργέ- vac. |
| 4 | [του τῆς πόλεως] διὰ προγόνων, ἀνθ' ὧν εἰς vac. |
| 5 | []του διηνεκῶς ἀπαράλλα- |
| 6 | [κτ-] vac. |

⁹ The evidence for governors' being accompanied by female relatives is collected and analyzed by M. Kajava, *Roman Senatorial Women and the Greek East: Epigraphic Evidence from the Republican and Augustan Period*, (Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History, Societas Scientiarum Fennica Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 91, Helsinki 1990, 59–124.

¹⁰ Cf. I.Stratonikeia 1321 (cited in n. 3) and I.Stratonikeia 1010 (cited in n. 7).

With this much of the text established, we can now turn to this inscription's date and historical context, issues which are closely connected with the question of Silanus' identity. Gregory has already brought two individuals into the discussion. The first of these, M. Iunius Silanus (pr. 77), was proconsul of Asia in 76 B.C.¹¹ Like the Silanus of our inscription, this man is attested as a patron, but of the nearby city of Mylasa¹². In light of the proximity of these two cities, John Nicols had suggested, even before this new Stratoniceian inscription was published, that the patrons of Mylasa and Stratoniceia were the same individual¹³. Against Nicols' suggestion, however, is the conviction of Varinlioğlu (who knows the inscriptions of Stratoniceia better than anyone) that the letter-forms of the new inscription from Stratoniceia require an Imperial date¹⁴. By itself, of course, such a consideration is not decisive. The publication of the text establishes an important new detail that makes Nicols' identification less tenable: the M. Silanus in Stratoniceia was a *πάτρων διὰ προγόνων*, which implies that his father, grandfather, or other ancestor had been patron of the city before him. By contrast, in nearby Mylasa, M. Silanus (pr. 77) is called simply *πάτρων*, which raises the possibility that this man is the ancestor in question, and that the Silanus of our new inscription, who is *πάτρων διὰ προγόνων* of Stratoniceia, is a descendant of his.

One such descendant was M. Iunius Silanus (cos. A.D. 46), and both Varinlioğlu and Gregory have suggested that he is the individual mentioned in our new inscription¹⁵. Several points argue against this identification. None of them is decisive by itself, though cumulatively their effect is serious. The first of these relates to this man's own history. Silanus became governor of Asia in A.D. 54 and was the last proconsul to go to Asia under Claudius¹⁶. In theory, his proconsulship could have provided the city with an opportunity both to renew the relationship that it had had with his family and to set up the monument on which this inscription appeared. According to Tacitus, however, Silanus became the first victim of Nero's new regime and was murdered in the province soon after his accession in October 54¹⁷. Evidently, he will have been present in his province for only a few months before being assassinated. This leaves little time for Stratoniceia to co-opt him as patron and to commemorate the occasion with the above inscription. Moreover, Tacitus implies that his assassins made no attempt to conceal their deed, which implies that imperial disfavour towards Silanus will have been obvious to all in the province in the aftermath of his death. It is not likely that Stratoniceia would want to publicize its connection to a man who was

¹¹ T. R. S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, Atlanta 1950–1986, II 94, III 114–115.

¹² I.Mylasa 109 = Le Bas-Waddington, III no. 409.

¹³ J. Nicols, *Patrons of Greek Cities in the Early Principate*, ZPE 80 (1990) 81–100, at p. 98.

¹⁴ Gregory (n. 2) 90 reports Varinlioğlu's opinion, which is in any case implicit in Varinlioğlu's (n. 1) own comments.

¹⁵ So Varinlioğlu (n. 1) 93 and Gregory (n. 2) 89–90; contra, Nicols (n. 13) 98.

¹⁶ U. Vogel-Weidemann, *Die Statthalter von Africa und Asia in den Jahren 14–68 n. Chr.*, Bonn 1982, 398–399.

¹⁷ Tac., *Ann.* XIII 1, 1: *prima novo principatu mors Iunii Silani proconsulis Asiae*. Cf. Dio LXI 6, 4; Plin., *Nat. Hist.* VII 58.

eliminated as a threat to the new emperor: devotion to Silanus could easily be misinterpreted as disloyalty to the imperial house. Identifying him as the Silanus of our new inscription, then, must assume both that this inscription belongs to this narrow chronological window before his death, and that the city fathers of Stratoniceia would not have been motivated to remove the evidence of their association with him.

A second problem with identifying our Silanus as the consul of A.D. 46 is that our inscription reveals him to be patron of Stratoniceia, and senatorial patrons of Greek cities had become rare by the end of Augustus' reign, as Nicols has demonstrated¹⁸. Admittedly, this phenomenon is not as consistent as Nicols argues¹⁹; nor is he persuasive in explaining this decline by suggesting that Augustus had introduced a new measure that forbade peregrine cities from co-opting governors as patrons. Still, senatorial city patrons, even those described as διὰ προγόνων, become very rare in Greek inscriptions after the reign of Augustus²⁰. This weighs against identifying the consul of A.D. 46 as the patron of Stratoniceia.

A third and final consideration concerns ancestral patronage. As we have seen, the patron of Stratoniceia is probably a descendant of the praetor of 77, who was patron of Mylasa. Although the consul of A.D. 46 was related to him, the connection is a rather distant one: he was this man's great-great-grandson. At least one case is known from the West where 'ancestral' patronage was perpetuated over such a long period, the relationship between the Claudii Marcelli and Syracuse. In the East, however, hereditary honours do not seem to be so enduring. Indeed, in those cases where something can be said about the origin of such relationships, the connections are almost always more immediate. A good example of this is an inscription from Claros, which calls L. Valerius Flaccus (pr. 63) a πατέρων διὰ προγόνων of Colophon²¹. Another inscription refers to his father, L. Valerius Flaccus (suff. 86), simply as πατέρων of that city²². Apparently the son was continuing or renewing a relationship that his father began. Similarly, several inscriptions honour L. Calpurnius Piso the Augur (cos. 1 B.C.) as patron or benefactor διὰ προγόνων²³; his father, Cn. Piso (cos. 23), served under Brutus in the East before the battle of Philippi²⁴, and it was probably at this time that these relationships originated²⁵. Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 32) is

¹⁸ Nicols (n. 13).

¹⁹ Gregory (n. 2) 89–90.

²⁰ No senatorial πατέρων διὰ προγόνων is attested after the reign of Augustus.

²¹ SEG 35, 1124. He was also patron of Tralles a *patre atque maioribus* (Cic., *Flacc.* 53). For a different identification, see F. Coarelli, *Su alcuni proconsoli d'Asia tra la fine del II e gli inizi del I secolo A.C. e sulla politica di Mario in oriente*, *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* 1 (Tituli 4, 1982), 435–451 at 438. This identification, however, cannot be correct.

²² SEG 29, 1130. Another inscription from Claros (SEG 29, 1129bis) honours C. Valerius Flaccus (cos. 93) as πατέρων τῆς πόλεως. He was, respectively, brother and uncle of the suffect consul of 86 and the praetor of 63.

²³ Piso the Augur was the διὰ πρόγονων εὐεργέτην of Mytilene (IG XII 2, 219 = OGIS 467 = ILS 8814) and was probably the πατέρων καὶ εὐεργέτην διὰ προγόνων of Stratoniceia (I.Stratoniceia 1010) and the διὰ προγόνων εὐεργέτην of Pergamum (I.Pergamon 425 = IGR IV 410).

²⁴ Tac., *Ann.* II 43. Cn. Piso was present at Oropus (IG VII 268), probably at the same time as Brutus (IG VII 383).

²⁵ Kajava (n. 9) 83–84; Syme, *Augustan Aristocracy*, 368.

a patron διὰ προγόνων of Ephesus and Samos²⁶, and it is probably his father, L. Ahenobarbus (cos. 54), who is honoured as patron of nearby Miletus and Chios²⁷, as I have recently argued²⁸. Obviously, it is not possible to trace the origins of all such relationships²⁹. Nevertheless, in those cases in the East where something can be said about the history of the relationship, the original patron and the patron διὰ προγόνων are father and son. It is, of course, not impossible that patronal relationships could be perpetuated over a longer period, as we know was the case with the Marcelli and Sicily. The evidence from the East, however, suggests this was not typical, at least in this region. In light of this, an identification of the ancestral patron will be more convincing if it proposes a closer relative to the putative originator of the relationship, who (as we have seen) should probably be identified as the praetor of 77.

As it happens, another individual meets this criterion: his son, M. Iunius D. f. Silanus (cos. 25)³⁰. Like his father, it seems that he was a governor of Asia. The evidence for this man's proconsulship involves a letter of Agrippa to Ephesus, which Josephus has included in his *Jewish Antiquities*³¹. Agrippa informs the Ephesians that he had also written „to the governor Silanus“ (Σιλανῷ τῷ στρατηγῷ) to remind him that Jews could not be summoned to court on their Sabbath. His identity has been the matter of some controversy. The fact that this document refers to Silanus as στρατηγός led Atkinson to assert that he had governed the province as a *praetorius*, not (like all other known Asian proconsuls of the principate) as a consular. She further argued that since M. Silanus was consul before Agrippa's eastern mission, he could not be the praetorian governor mentioned in Agrippa's letter³². Although the term στρατηγός is sometimes used to translate Latin *praetor*³³, it hardly needs to be pointed out that Silanus could not have held this office in the year of his governorship: That would render nonsensical everything we know about the Augustan settlement. As far as we know, the term never means *ex-praetor*, which is normally rendered στρατηγικός³⁴. Presumably in using the term στρατηγός, Agrippa meant only to

²⁶ *Milet*, I 2, 92, no. 12b = AE 1909, 87 (Miletus); *Arch. Delt.* 11 (1927/8) 25 no. 4 = AE 1932, 6 (Chios).

²⁷ *AM* 75 (1960) 138 no. 32 (Samos); *JÖAI* 49 (1968–71) Beibl., 53 no. 21 = I.Ephesos 663.

²⁸ C. Eilers, *Some Domitii Ahenobarbi and their Greek Clientela*, in: XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina, Roma 18–24 settembre 1997, Atti, I, Rome 1999, 325–333. On IGR IV 968 (Samos), see C. Eilers, *Cn. Domitius and Samos: A New Extortion Trial (IGR 4, 968)*, *ZPE* 89 (1991) 167–178.

²⁹ Ti. Claudius Nero (pr. 42) was *patronus a maioribus* of Nysa (Cic., *Fam.* XIII 64), but it is unclear how far back the relationship went (Levick [n. 49] 484, Badian CR 24 [1974] 186). Potitus Messalla was πάτρωνα καὶ εὐεργέτην διὰ προγόνων of Magnesia ad Sipylum (I.Magnesia am Sipylus 2 = OGIS 460 = Le Bas-Waddington, III no. 1660a = IGR IV 1338), without obvious explanation; cf. Syme, *JRS* 45 (1955) 158 = *Roman Papers*, I 265.

³⁰ This possibility is mentioned by Gregory (n. 2) 90.

³¹ *Jos., Ant. Jud.* XVI 167–168.

³² K. M. T. Atkinson, *The Governors of the Province Asia in the Reign of Augustus*, *Historia* 7 (1958) 300–330 at 305, followed with diffidence by Thomasson, *Laterculi Praesidum*, I, Göteborg 1984, 206.

³³ H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*, Toronto 1974, 86; 159.

³⁴ Mason (n. 33) 86.

identify Silanus as „governor“³⁵, without implying anything about how far the senator had progressed along the *cursus honorum*³⁶. In so doing, he was operating within a long-standing literary, epigraphic and legal tradition³⁷. The term can, of course, refer to governors of praetorian standing³⁸, but such a reference cannot establish whether a governor was consular or praetorian.

The suggestion that Agrippa was referring in his letter to a praetorian governor is problematic in any case. No *praetorii* are attested among the governors of Asia and Africa under the principate. L. Cornelius Balbus is sometimes cited as an exception to this principle³⁹. Admittedly, Balbus never held the consulship. Augustus, however, bestowed consular rank on him⁴⁰, which presumably implies that he entered the provincial sortition as a consular, and there is therefore no reason to suppose that Silanus possessed a status different from that of all other known imperial proconsuls of Asia.

Who was the governor of Asia to whom Agrippa wrote? Since he must have been an ex-consul, only two identifications are possible: he was either M. Iunius Silanus (cos. 25 B.C.), or C. Iunius Silanus (cos. 17 B.C.). Nothing is known about C. Silanus' career following his consulship⁴¹, and (as Syme has already suggested⁴²) it is better to identify him as M. Iunius Silanus (cos. 25). Our new inscription from Stratoniceia, which shows that a M. Silanus (probably governor) was a patron of that city, may now confirm this. Identifying Stratoniceia's patron as the consul of 25 B.C. would also avoid the difficulties involved in associating this inscription with either the praetor of 77 B.C. or the consul of A.D. 46. On the one hand, the letter-forms would be more consistent with an Augustan date than a date in the Republic, and there is no need to explain how the praetor of 77, who probably was the original patron, came to be described as *πάτρων διὰ προγόνων*. On the other hand, Stratoniceia would not be celebrating an enemy of the imperial house. The inscription would belong to a period when, to judge from the epigraphic evidence, senatorial patrons of Greek cities were still common. Finally, the origins of the ancestral connection would be easily explained and typical of other known relationships of this type in the region: The Augustan consular was the son of the praetor of 77, who seems to have been the man who originated the relationship⁴³.

³⁵ Mason (n. 33) 86; Cicero (*Flacc. passim*) consistently refers to L. Valerius Flaccus (pr. 63) as *praetor*, although his formal title was *ἀνθύπατος* or *proconsul* (cf. SEG 35, 1124, Claros).

³⁶ Tac., *Ann.* IV 15 refers to a *proconsul* of Asia, who was an *ex-consul*, as a *praetor*.

³⁷ Mason (n. 33) 86, 155–158.

³⁸ Mason (n. 33) 86, 162.

³⁹ Atkinson (n. 32) 305. Balbus was *proconsul* of Africa in 21/20 (Inscript. Ital. XIII 1, p. 87, with B. Thomasson, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus*, Lund 1960, II, 11; idem, *Laterculi Praesidium*, 371).

⁴⁰ Vell. II 51, 3 with Groag, *PIR*² C 1331.

⁴¹ Petersen, *PIR*² I 823; Syme, *Augustan Aristocracy*, 191 n. 27.

⁴² Syme, *Augustan Aristocracy*, 191 and n. 27 and F. Münzer, *RE* 10.2 (1919) 1095 s. v. Iunius no. 170; cf. Petersen, *PIR*² I 823, 830; Thomasson, *Laterculi*, 206; Magic, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton 1950, 1342 n. 34.

⁴³ Syme, *Augustan Aristocracy*, 191; Petersen, *PIR*² I 830; Münzer, *RE* 10.2 (1919) 1095 s. v. Iunius no. 170.

Silanus' proconsulship will have fallen in one of the two periods when Agrippa held an extraordinary command in the region: 23 to 21 or 18 to 13⁴⁴. Two others who governed Asia in these years are Sex. Appuleius (cos. 29) and Potitus Valerius Messalla (suff. 29 B.C.). Thomasson dated the proconsulship of Appuleius, which we know lasted two years⁴⁵, to the years 23–21 B.C. (with a query)⁴⁶. An argument, however, can be made for an earlier date. Inscriptions from Assos reveal that revenues that Appuleius returned to the city were used to rebuild two buildings⁴⁷, and in Ephesus a road was paved during his proconsulship from income that is described as Augustus' gift to the goddess⁴⁸. There was an earthquake in the region in 27 or 26⁴⁹, and the rebuilding and construction mentioned in these inscriptions would be normal in the aftermath of such a disaster. Also, the diversion of income to pay for this construction, presumably implying a remission of taxes, is similar to Roman initiatives following other earthquakes⁵⁰. Appuleius was presumably available to go to Asia following his triumph of January 26⁵¹ perhaps as early as the following summer. Thus Appuleius could have been proconsul as early as 26–24 B.C. Admittedly, such a date would not be consistent with Dio's description of the changes that Augustus introduced to provincial government. According to Dio, Augustus limited governors' terms to a single year and imposed a five-year interval between magistracy and promagistracy⁵². In 26, Appuleius would not yet have waited the required time. It is clear, however, that Appuleius did not serve a single-year term either. In any case, we know that Dio includes in his discussion of 27 measures that actually came later⁵³, and if the single-year term and the minimum interval were among them, a date of 26–24 for Appuleius' proconsulship becomes possible.

If this date is more or less correct, the two other proconsulships of these years, of Potitus Valerius Messalla (suff. 29) and M. Silanus (cos. 25), fall into place. Seniority

⁴⁴ The details of Agrippa's two sojourns in the East are conveniently collected in H. Halfmann, *Itinera principum: Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich*, Stuttgart 1986, 163–166.

⁴⁵ U. Weidemann, *Arch. Anz.* (1965) 463–464.

⁴⁶ Thomasson, *Laterculi*, 206.

⁴⁷ I.Assos 24b = Le Bas-Waddington, III no. 1034 = IGR IV 253: [ἐπὶ Σέξτου Ἀπολλήϊου ἀνθυπάτου κ]αὶ πάτρωνος τῆς πόλεως, [ἐκ τῶν ἀποκατα]σταθαισῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τῇ πόλει [προσόδων ἀποκατεστάθ]η. Cf. also I.Assos 24a, with the same text.

⁴⁸ I.Ephesos 459 = AE 1966, 425 with G. Alföldy, *ZPE* 87 (1991) 158: [beneficio Ca[esaris] | [A]ugusti ex rediti[bus] | agrorum sacroru[m] | quos is Dianae de[dit], via strata Sex[to] Appul[ei]o procos. | [τ]ῇ Καίσαρος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ | [χάριτι] ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν προσόδων | [ἄ]ς αὐτὸς τῇ θεᾷ ἐχαρί[σατο], | ὁδὸς ἐστρώθη ἐπὶ ἀνθυπάτου Σέξτου Ἀπολλήϊου.

⁴⁹ Eus., *Chron. Hier.* II 164 (Helm); Agathias II 17; Strabo XII 8, 18 (579); Suet., *Tib.* 8; G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford 1965, 157–161; B. M. Levick, *The beginnings of Tiberius' career*, *CQ* 21 (1971) 478–486.

⁵⁰ Cf. Dio LIV 30, 2 (12 B.C.); Tac., *Ann.* II 47, 1 (A.D. 17).

⁵¹ *Inscript. Ital.* XIII 1, p. 87.

⁵² Dio LIII 13, 2; LIII 14, 2.

⁵³ P. A. Brunt, *The Role of the Senate in the Augustan Regime*, *CQ* 34 (1984) 431 and n. 45, 433; K. M. Girardet, *Die Entmachtung des Konsulates im Übergang von der Republik zur Monarchie und die Rechtsgrundlagen des augusteischen Prinzipats*, in: *Pratum Saraviense: Festgabe für Peter Steinmetz*, (Palingenesia 30), Stuttgart 1990, 89–136 at 115–116.

was an important principle in the sortition⁵⁴, and Messalla, who was a suffect of 29, will have been next in consular seniority when Appuleius, consul ordinarius of 29, completed his term. Like Appuleius, Messalla served as governor for two years⁵⁵, perhaps for the years 24–22. Messalla's biennium contradicts Dio's report of Augustus' arrangement, but this again probably illustrates the anachronistic nature of Dio's description.

Silanus (cos. 25) was consul four years after Messalla. Despite the interval, Silanus was the next most senior consular after him: The consuls of the intervening years were Augustus, Agrippa, and Statilius Taurus; their consulships will not have affected their seniority, since they all had held earlier consulships. In any case, they clearly were not about to govern a public province, and so when Messalla's term was finished, Silanus was presumably among the next most senior consulars available. His term could therefore be as early as 22/21, which would date his proconsulship to a year when Agrippa was in the East, as we know was the case from the letter reported by Josephus.

Taking the above points together, I arrange the provincial governors of Asia for these years as follows, though the entire sequence could be down-dated another year.

26/25	Sex. Appuleius (cos. 29 B.C.)
25/24	Sex. Appuleius
24/23	Potitus Valerius Messalla (suff. 29 B.C.)
23/22	Potitus Valerius Messalla
22/21	M. Iunius Silanus (cos. 25 B.C.)

The point that immediately arises from this arrangement is that these proconsuls all contravene at least one of the principles that Dio ascribes to Augustus' new provincial arrangement. This is all the more striking since they will have been among the first appointed under this scheme. Appuleius and Messalla both governed for a two-year term (as the evidence clearly shows)⁵⁶, while Appuleius and Silanus did not, on the above arrangement, observe a five-year interval. It would be possible, of course, to down-date these governors and make their terms consistent with the five-year rule, provided that Silanus' term is made to coincide with Agrippa's second Eastern mission. That, however, would probably sacrifice the good to keep the bad. As we have seen, there is every advantage in dating Appuleius' proconsulship to the aftermath of the earthquake of c. 26, and the rules reported in Dio may not have yet been in operation.

To conclude, we have seen that the new inscription from Stratoniceia probably appeared on a statue base of a female relative, perhaps a daughter, of a patron of that city. He is best identified as M. Iunius Silanus (cos. 25), which confirms the suggestion of Syme that Silanus was proconsul of Asia under Augustus. He probably governed this province in the late 20s B.C., and seems to have „inherited“ this patro-

⁵⁴ Tac., *Ann.* III 58, 71 with R. J. A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton 1984, 349.

⁵⁵ ILS 8964.

⁵⁶ See notes 45 and 55.

nal relationship over Stratoniceia from his father, the praetor of 77 B.C., who had also been proconsul before him.

Department of Classics
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario,
L8S 3Y6
Canada

Claude Eilers